

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,551	ANDRUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Ouellette	3629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette.

(3) David Jordan (Reg. No. 50325).

(2) Dmitry Brant.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 November 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All Independent.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mc Farlane (US 2002/0111887 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Brant and Mr. Jordan presented a proposed amendment to the independent claims (see attached). Furthermore, Examiner Ouellette suggested some additional amendments to include: "entering" business goals into the system, and adding "automated language" to the action recommendation determination and cost savings calculation steps. Finally, Examiner Ouellette stated that the independent claims with the proposed amendments in combination with the suggested amendments would read over the cited prior art.